



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,333	12/21/2001	Gilles Rubinstenn	05725.0974-00	4711

22852 7590 08/22/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

ARAQUE JR, GERARDO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/024,333		RUBINSTENN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Gerardo Araque Jr.		3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28, 29, 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-13-2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

### *Claim Objections*

2. **Claims 28 – 29** are objected to because of the following informalities: In regards to claim 28, the applicant discloses the term "representative image." However, the applicant has introduced this term as "image representative." Appropriate correction is required.

3. **Claim 37** is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant uses the terminology, "...means for receiving receives the..." which makes the claim awkward. The examiner suggests to rephrase it as, "means for receiving comprise receiving the representation image..." in order to clarify the wording of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 1 – 30, 32 – 46 and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. In regard to **claims 1, 32, and 48**, the applicant discloses, "...maintaining in a database information of how..." in the claims. However, the current phrasing is

awkward in that the examiner is reading it as, "...maintaining in a database, information of how..." and "...maintaining in a database information of how..." and throughout the application the applicant is referring it to as "database information" and "information in the database." The examiner suggests for the applicant to rephrase the terminology being used and to be consistent in referring back to the terminology, i.e. refer back to it as "database information" or "information in the database" or whatever way that the examiner will introduce it as in order to be more consistent.

7. In regard to **claims 21 and 45**, the examiner does not understand why a portion of the information in the database based on the comparing is selected and how only using a portion of the information based on the comparing is used for the prognosis. The examiner would appreciate if the applicant can clarify the wording or present an explanation of what is going on.

8. **Claim 48** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The applicant discloses a computer readable medium that contains instructions for carrying out a method. However, as it is currently written the applicant has not done anything with the data, i.e. that data is just being contained on the medium and has not instructed anything to carry out the instructions.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3629

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. **Claims 31 – 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kenet et al. (US Patent 5,291,889).

11. In regard to **claims 31 – 32**, Kenet discloses a computer for receiving a representation in memory (Column 4 Lines 19 – 21), a database for storing information (inherently included in a computer system), a processor (inherently included in a computer system) for modifying the representation (Column 3 Lines 1 – 4), and a driver (display) for outputting the prognosis (Column 3 Lines 27 – 29).

12. **Claim 47** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linford (US Patent 6,081,611).

13. In regards to **claim 47**, Linford discloses a memory for receiving data, secondary storage for storing data, a database containing data, processor for rendering, modifying, and generating an image (Column 5 Lines 30 – 36) and driver for outputting an image (Column 5 Lines 47 – 48).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3629

15. **Claims 1 – 4, 6 – 24, 27 – 29, and 33 – 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenet et al. (US Patent 5,291,889) in view of Proactiv ([http://web.archive.org/web/20010521145551rn\\_1/www.proactiv.com/index.php](http://web.archive.org/web/20010521145551rn_1/www.proactiv.com/index.php)).

16. In regard to **claim 1 and 48**, Kenet discloses a method and system of determining a prognosis for an external body condition comprising receiving a representation of a subject's external body condition (Column 1 Lines 57 – 60), a database for storing information (Column 2 Lines 67 – 68), generating a prognosis after use of a beauty product based on the representation and information (Column 1 Lines 46 – 47; Column 3 Lines 25 - 29), and outputting the prognosis to enable the subject to receive the prognosis (Column 3 Lines 25 – 29). However, Kenet fails to explicitly show "...maintaining in a database information of how using a beauty product affects the evolution of an external body condition."

Proactiv, however, does show how the use of a beauty product affects the evolution of an external body condition (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010411110515/www.proactiv.com/products/products.php>) in a database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the time of the invention to modify Kenet in view of the teachings of Proactive to include information on how the use of a beauty product affects the evolution of an external body condition in order to better inform and demonstrate to a user of the products effects.

17. In regards to **claim 2**, Kenet discloses that the representation defines the external body condition (Column 1 Lines 46 – 47).

18. In regards to **claim 3**, Kenet discloses that the representation defines an image representation of the external body condition (Column 2 Lines 57 – 60).

19. In regards to **claim 4**, Kenet discloses a prognosis image (Column 3 Lines 25 – 29).

20. In regards to **claim 6**, it is inherently implied by Proactiv that instruction relating to obtaining instructions to obtaining a representation is included since they have pictures of people who have used the product

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20010617232049/www.proactiv.com/realstories/real.php>).

21. In regard to **claims 7 and 34**, Kenet discloses a digitized video image as being the representation of the subject (Columns 2 – 3 Lines 68; 1).

22. In regard to **claims 8 and 35**, Kenet and Proactiv, in combination as discussed above, disclose constructing an image based on the representation (Column 3 Lines 1 – 4; <http://web.archive.org/web/20010617232049/www.proactiv.com/realstories/real.php>, <http://web.archive.org/web/20010411110515/www.proactiv.com/products/products.php>, <http://web.archive.org/web/20010215033109/www.proactiv.com/how/how.php>).

23. In regards to **claim 9**, it is implied in Kenet that image morphing information must be included in order to make the representative image.

24. In regards to **claim 10 and 37**, it is old and well known in the art to send representations of an individual through the postal service.

25. In regard to **claims 11 and 38**, Kenet discloses the usage of digital images, which would imply requiring a storage device. Furthermore, as can be seen by the “Real Stories” section, the data storage device having the representation had to be

received in order for the present images to be displayed on the website

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20010617232049/www.proactiv.com/realstories/real.php>).

26. In regard to **claim 12 and 39**, Kenet discloses the using before and after images of individuals when testing cosmetics. It would have, therefore, been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to a subset of information relating to differing beauty products given that the organization selling the products have more than one product in their line.

27. In regards to **claim 13 and 40**, Proactiv discloses displaying product information (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010215033109/www.proactiv.com/how/how.php>).

28. In regard to **claim 14 and 41**, Proactiv discloses a database with subsets of information on using a beauty product (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010215020151/www.proactiv.com/faq/faq3.php>, <http://web.archive.org/web/20010215020034/www.proactiv.com/faq/faq4.php>).

29. In regard to **claim 15 and 42**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to print out the information pages provided by Proactiv.

30. In regard to **claim 16 and 43**, Proactiv discloses different manners of using the products (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010215020151/www.proactiv.com/faq/faq3.php>, <http://web.archive.org/web/20010215020034/www.proactiv.com/faq/faq4.php>).

31. In regard to **claims 17 – 19**, the fact that the applicant discloses various embodiments of the beauty products does not change the function of how the method works. The combination of Kenet and Proactiv disclose the usage of cosmetics and beauty products and their effects.



32. In regard to **claim 20 and 44**, Proactiv discloses purchasing the beauty products (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010411110515/www.proactiv.com/products/products.php>)

33. In regard to **claim 21 and 45**, as best understood by the examiner, Kenet discloses generating a prognosis comparing the representation with information in the database and selecting a portion of the information based on the comparing (Column 2 Lines 23 - 26).

34. In regard to **claim 22 and 46**, Proactiv discloses transmitting the prognosis via a network (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010411110515/www.proactiv.com/products/products.php>)

35. In regard to **claims 23 – 24**, it is inherently implied by Proactiv that if a consumer were to finish one of the three products available in the set that they would have the option of ordering only one of the three products as oppose to buying all three and always having an incomplete set before the new set is set out after a predetermined time period.

36. In regards to **claim 36**, Kenet discloses that the representation defines an image representation of the external body condition (Column 2 Lines 57 – 60). It is further implied in Kenet that image morphing information must be included in order to make the representative image.

37. **Claims 5 and 25 – 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenet et al. (US Patent 5,291,889) in view of Proactiv ([http://web.archive.org/web/20010521145551rn\\_1/www.proactiv.com/index.php](http://web.archive.org/web/20010521145551rn_1/www.proactiv.com/index.php)) and in further view of Linford et al. (US Patent 6,081,611).

38. In regards to **claim 5**, Linford discloses rendering the prognosis on a three-dimensional image (Column 25 Lines 25 – 27).

39. In regards to **claim 25**, Linford discloses rendering the prognosis on a three-dimensional image (Column 25 Lines 25 – 27). Furthermore, it is implied that a three-dimensional image contains a mesh (polygons) in order to properly and accurately modify a three-dimensional image.

40. In regards to **claim 26**, Linford discloses generating a mathematical model corresponding to a three-dimensional mesh image (Column 25 Lines 36 – 44).

41. In regards to **claim 27**, Kenet and Proactiv are discussed above, however, they fail to teach enabling modification of a representative image based on an input by the subject.

Linford, however, does teach a similar method and system for a prognosis based on the effects of a beauty product. Furthermore, Linford also teaches manipulating a patient's image in response to feedback provided by the patient (Column 4 Lines 5 – 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kenet and Proactiv in view of the teachings of Linford to have a means of manipulating a patient's image in response to feedback provided by the patient.

42. In regards to **claim 28**, Linford discloses the modifications of wrinkles from the image representative (Column 24 Lines 66 – 67).

43. In regards to **claim 29**, Linford inherently implies that at least one parameter associated with a mathematical model for the modification of wrinkles from the image representative (Column 25 Lines 19 – 44).

44. In regards to **claim 30**, it is inherently implied that a parameter must be modified from the mathematical model in order to generate a prognosis.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerardo Araque Jr. whose telephone number is (571)272-3747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 4:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/024,333  
Art Unit: 3629

Page 11

GA  
8-15-06



JOHN G. WEISS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800